

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 00950 01 OF 02 202212Z

64

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-03 INR-07 L-02 ACDA-05

NSAE-00 PA-01 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00 SAJ-01

SS-15 NSC-05 OIC-02 /063 W

----- 118913

R 201810Z FEB 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 219

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 5041

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

CINCUSAREUR

CINCUSAFE

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 0950

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: MPOL, NATO

SUBJ: FEB. 19 DRC MEETING: MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE

REF: A. USNATO 0901

B. USNATO 0575

C. USNATO 0460 (NOTAL)

D. STATE 022506 (NOTAL)

E. USNATO 0454 (NOTAL)

BEGIN SUMMARY: DURING FEB 19 MEETING, DRC BEGAN DISCUSSING SPECIFIC CONTENT OF IS-PREPARED DRAFT (REF B) AND US INPUT ON "NATO DEFENSE IN THE LONG TERM" (REFS C AND D) FOR 1975 MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE DOCUMENT. DRC ASKED IS TO PREPARE NEW INTRODUCTORY PARAGRAPHS WHICH PROVIDED MORE COMPLETE EXPLANATION WHY LONG RANGE DEFENSE CONCEPT IS IN 1975 GUIDANCE DOCUMENT, ASKED IS, IN CONJUNCTION WITH US, TO AMEND "NATO DEFENSE IN CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 00950 01 OF 02 202212Z

THE LONG TERM" SECTION SO IT PROVIDES FULLER DESCRIPTION OF LONG TERM DEFENSE CONCEPT AND MESHES MORE SMOOTHLY WITH REMAINING GUIDANCE DOCUMENT; AND ASKED UK TO PROVIDE DRC WITH UK DRAFT INPUT ON WARNING OR WAR FOR MC-161(75). DRC WILL

CONTINUE DETAILED DISCUSSION OF DRAFT GUIDANCE DURING MEETING
FEB 25. END SUMMARY.

1. DURING INTRODUCTORY REMARKS TO FEB 19 DRC DISCUSSION
OF MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE, CHAIRMAN HUMPHREYS RE-EMPHASIZED THAT
DRC SHOULD DEVELOP MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE WHICH IS "PRECISE,
DEFINITE, AND INCAPABLE OF MISINTERPRETATION" (REF A) AND
ASKED REPS FOR SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON DRAFT DOCUMENTS (REFS B,
C AND D).

2. REFERRING TO PREVIOUS DRC DISCUSSION (REF A, PARA 2A), MC
REP (GEN TOMMASINI) SAID MC COULD NOT REPEAT NOT PRODUCE AGREED
MC-161(75) DOCUMENT UNTIL MID-APRIL INTELLIGENCE CONFERENCE:
THAT SPECIAL STUDY ON WARNING TIME (REF E) WOULD DRAW FROM
AGREED MC-161(75) DOCUMENT; AND THAT NEITHER COULD THEREFORE
SERVE AS BASIS FOR WARNING OF WAR SECTION IN THIS SPRING'S
MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE DOCUMENT. UK REP (LEGGIE) AGREED, BUT
SAID UK WAS DRAFTING WARNING TIME SECTION FOR MC-161(75) AND
OFFERED TO PROVIDE UK DRAFT FOR DRC CONSIDERATION RELATIVE TO
MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE. CHAIRMAN HUMPHREYS ACCEPTED OFFER, BUT
CAUTIONED AGAINST DRC ATTEMPTING TO EVALUATE UK DRAFT
SIMULTANEOUSLY WITH SIMILAR ACTION BY INTELLIGENCE AUTHORITIES.
HE SAID DRC WOULD USE UK INPUT FOR BACKGROUND INFORMATION ONLY.

3. ITALIAN REP (ADM. MACCHIAVELLI) CIRCULATED FOLLOWING PROPOSED
SUBSTITUTE FOR DRAFT INTRODUCTORY PARAS 1-3. BEGIN QUOTE:

1 - THE AGREED PROCEDURES FOR DEFENCE PLANNING IN NATO
(DPC/D(71)10) CALL FOR MINISTERS TO GIVE GUIDANCE EVERY TWO
YEARS FOR THE SHAPING OF FORCE PROPOSALS FORMULATED BY THE
MAJOR NATO COMMANDERS AND ENDORSED BY THE MILITARY COMMITTEE.
BEING A MAJOR FOR ALL DEFENCE PLANNING ACTIVITIES BOTH
NATIONAL AND MULTINATIONAL WITHIN NATO.

2 - THE GUIDANCE LOOKS INTO THE POLITICAL, ECONOMIC,
TECHNOLOGICAL AND MILITARY FACTORS WHICH COULD AFFECT THE
DEVELOPMENT OF NATO FORCES DURING THE PERIOD COVERED BY THE
FORCE PROPOSALS (I.E. THE NEXT SEVEN YEARS). NEVERTHELESS THE
PECULIAR ASPECTS OF THE PRESENT SITUATION ASK FOR THE
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 00950 01 OF 02 202212Z

ESTABLISHMENT OF SOME BASIC PRINCIPLES THAT, IN THE CONTEXT
OF THE CURRENT STRATEGY, MAY GIVE GUIDANCE FOR THE LONG TERM
(I.E. NOT SPECIFICALLY RELATED TO THE PERIOD UNDER CONSIDERATION).
END QUOTE. ITALIAN REP SAID HIS DRAFT PROVIDED MORE EFFECTIVE
RATIONALE FOR INCLUDING LONG-RANGE DEFENSE CONCEPT IN MINISTERIAL
GUIDANCE. NETHERLANDS (CARSTEN), NORWEGIAN(LEINE), DANISH
(ROSENTHAL), TURKISH (TOPUR) AND CANADIAN (COL SHEFFIELD) REPS
GENERALLY SUPPORTED ITALIAN POSITION ON EXPANDED RATIONALE FOR
LONG-RANGE DEFENSE CONCEPT, BUT OFFERED NUMEROUS SPECIFIC CRIT-
ICISMS OF ITALIAN-PROPOSED LANGUAGE. US REP (BGEN BOWMAN) SAID
ITALIAN DRAFT IMPLIED THAT MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE WAS A
DIRECTIVE TO MILITARY AUTHORITIES, BUT ONLY A REFERENCE POINT
FOR NATIONS AND NATO PLANNING AUTHORITIES. HE SAID DEFENSE

MINISTERS HAD DECIDED IN DECEMBER THAT 1975 MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE SHOULD BE DIRECTIVE IN NATURE FOR ALL THREE. DRC ASKED IS TO FORMULATE NEW INTRODUCTORY PARAS WHICH REFLECTED REPS' SUGGESTIONS AND PROVIDED BETTER EXPLANATION WHY LONG RANGE DEFENSE CONCEPT IS IN FINAL GUIDANCE DOCUMENT.

4. REPS GENERALLY AGREED THAT US INPUT ON "NATO DEFENSE IN THE LONG TERM" DID NOT REPEAT NOT MESH SMOOTHLY WITH DRAFT GUIDANCE DOCUMENT IN TOTO. UK REP, WITH VARYING DEGREES OF SUPPORT FROM CANADA, NORWAY, AND PORTUGAL (CATALANO), RECOMMENDED THAT DRC MERGE MAJOR ELEMENTS OF IS DRAFT (REF B)

SECTIONS ON "THE WARSAW PACT," "THE THREAT," AND "STRATEGIC BALANCE" WITH THE FIRST FOUR PARAS OF US INPUT (REF C AS AMENDED BY REF D) TO FORM NEW SECTION ON "NATO DEFENSE IN THE LONG TERM." HE SUGGESTED DRC PLACE REMAINING PORTIONS OF US INPUT IN SUBSEQUENT "RESOURCES," "PRIORITIES" AND "COMMON PLANS AND PROGRAMS" PORTIONS OF IS DRAFT. REPS SUPPORTING THIS APPROACH DID NOT REPEAT NOT SUBSTANTIVELY CRITICIZE CONTENTS OF US INPUT ON LONGA-RANGE DEFENSE EXCEPT FOR UK REP, WHO SAID HIS AUTHORITIES COULD NOT REPEAT NOT ACCEPT US CALL FOR 3-5 PERCENT ANNUAL INCREASES IN NATIONAL DEFENSE SPENDING. ITALAIN REP SAID SUCH A PERCENTAGE WAS TOO SPECIFIC FOR ALONG-RANGE DIRECTIVE EXTENDING THROUGH 1980'S AND SUGGESTED DRC ADD SUCH DETAILED GUIDANCE TO THOSE SECTIONS DEALING WITH SHORTER-TERM 1977-1982 PLANNING PERIOD.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 00950 02 OF 02 202215Z

64

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-03 INR-07 L-02 ACDA-05

NSAE-00 PA-01 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00 SAJ-01

SS-15 NSC-05 OIC-02 /063 W

----- 118989

R 201810Z FEB 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 220

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 5042

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

CINCUSAREUR

CINCUSAFE

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 0950

5. US REP SAID HIS AUTHORITIES WANTED US INPUT FOR NATO DEFENSE IN THE LONG TERM PRESENTED AS UNIFIED SECTION EARLY IN THE MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE DOCUMENT. HE AGREED THAT DRC SHOULD REVISE DOCUMENT TO ELIMINATE UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION AND SUGGESTED THEY FOCUS ON DRAFT SECTIONS FOLLOWING US INPUT. FRG (CAPT WELZ), NETHERLANDS, TURKISH AND DANISH REPS AGREED THAT DRC SHOULD RETAIN US INPUT INTACT WITH VARIOUS EDITORIAL CHANGES. CHAIRMAN HUMPHREYS SAID HE COULD FIND NOTHING IN US INPUT THAT SUBSEQUENT SECTIONS OF DRAFT FAILED TO COVER, BUT SAID US APPARENTLY BELIEVES LONG-RANGE DEFENSE CONCEPT IS A "SEAMLESS GARMENT" WHICH DRC SHOULD NOT REPEAT NOT "SPLIT". HE RECOMMENDED THAT IS, IN CONJUNCTION WITH US, MAKE "MINOR ADJUSTMENTS" TO US INPUT SO IT MORE EFFECTIVELY DESCRIBES THE LONG-RANGE DEFENSE CONCEPT AND PROVIDES COMPATIBLE INTRODUCTION TO REMAINING GUIDANCE SECTIONS. US REP AGREED.

6. UNDER ANY OTHER BUSINESS, MC REP REFERRED TO CHAIRMAN
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 00950 02 OF 02 202215Z

HUMPHREYS' PREVIOUS COMMENTS ABOUT MC REVIEW OF NATO "CONSULTATIONPROCESS" (REF A, PARA 5) AND SAID MC WAS DISCUSSING DEGREE OF RESPONSIBILITY IT HAD FOR PROPOSING FORCE STRUCTURE ALTERNATIVES AND COMPENSATING MEASURES DURING NATO CONSIDERATION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE REVIEWS. HE STRESSED PRELIMINARY NATURE OF MC DISCUSSIONS AND SAID MC WOULD CONSULT WITH APPROPRIATE NATO PLANNING AUTHORITIES IF MC DETERMINED THAT FORMAL CHANGES IN PROCEDURE WERE REQUIRED. CHAIRMAN HUMPHREYS HOPED THAT ONGOING MC DISCUSSIONS WOULD NOT REPEAT NOT RESULT IN MC AVOIDING COMPENSATORY PROPOSALS DURING NATO "CONSULTATION PROCESSES."BRUCE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 20 FEB 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GarlanWA
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO00950
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750286/abbrziio.tel
Line Count: 199
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. USNATO 0901 B. USNATO 0575 C. USNATO 0460 (NOTAL) D. STATE 022506 (NOTAL) E. USNATO 0454 (NOTAL)
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GarlanWA
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 04 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <04 APR 2003 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <04 APR 2003 by GarlanWA>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: FEB. 19 DRC MEETING: MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE
TAGS: MPOL, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
USCINCEUR
USNMR SHAPE
USLOSACLANT
CINCLANT

CINCUSAREUR
CINCUSAFE
MBFR VIENNA

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006